

REMARKS

The specification has been amended to correct an obvious typographical error.

Claims 1, 4 and 9 have been amended and claims 13 to 20 have been added. A check in the amount of \$86 is attached to cover the cost of the extra independent claim.

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jenks (U.S. 46,572). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 requires a sash lock including a rotatable lever having a tab extending therefrom and rotatable in a plane substantially normal to the plane of movement of the second window sash, the tab extending in a direction parallel to the direction of movement of the second window sash. No such feature is taught or suggested by Jenks either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 1 further requires a spring slide deformable by rotation of said rotatable lever and movement of the tab against the spring slide for selectively causing a portion of the spring slide to enter and retract from the aperture to cause locking and unlocking of the first and second window sashes relative to each other. No such feature is taught or suggested by Jenks in the combination as claimed.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and therefore defines patentably over Jenks for at least the reasons presented above with reference to claim 1.

In addition, claim 2 further limits claim 1 by requiring that the spring slide include a central aperture, the tab extending into the central aperture, rotation of the tab with the rotatable lever causing deformation of the spring slide and one of movement of the spring slide into or out

of the keeper aperture. No such feature is taught or suggested by Jenks either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claims 1 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ammerman (U.S. 530,078). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The arguments presented above with reference to claim 1 apply as well to this rejection and are incorporated by reference.

Claim 3 depends from claim 1 and therefore defines patentably over Ammerman for at least the reasons presented above with reference to claim 1.

In addition, claim 3 further limits claim 1 by requiring a housing having a shaft secured to the spring slide, the rotatable lever being rotatable about said shaft. No such feature is taught or suggested by Ammerman either alone or in the combination as claimed. It is not seen where the terms "capable of" are used in either claim 1 or 3.

The reference to claim 4 is not understood since this claim has been indicated to be allowable and is now rewritten in independent form.

Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jenks. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 5 and 6 depend from claims 1 and 2 and therefore define patentably over Jenks for at least the reasons presented above with reference to claims 1 and 2 respectively.

Claims 5 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ammerman. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 5 and 7 depend from claims 1 and 3 and therefore define patentably over Ammerman for at least the reasons presented above with reference to claims 1 and 3 respectively.

The allowability of claim 4 and 8 to 12 is noted with appreciation of which claim 9 is written in independent form and claims 10 to 12 depend from amended claim 1.

Claim 13 is original claim 1 plus the feature of the rotatable lever providing an audible sound responsive to a predetermined rotation of the rotatable lever. No such feature is taught or suggested by any of the cited references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claims 14 to 20 add the feature discussed above with reference to claim 13 to claims 1 to 4, 9 and 12.

In view of the above remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Jay M. Cantor
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 19,906
(301) 424-0355 (Phone)
(301) 279-0038(Fax)